Description for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Frogram - 2000/2009	
Aganay LISES Stanislava National Forget	
Agency: USFS - Stanislaus National Forest	
Applications Destauation Missale Diagrams	

6/2/2009

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # APP #

List of Restoration Activities

General Project Description

The Lyons Creek Meadow Restoration Planning grant proposal requests the funds needed to complete the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis/decision documentation and funds for for implementation of a meadow restoration project near Lyons Creek on the Mi-Wok Ranger District. The funding request covers all aspects of project planning: developing the proposed action, public scoping, resource surveys, analysis, evaluation and reports, and documentation of the decision. An estimate (based on other similar projects with similar activities) of the funding needed to implement the project is also part of the proposal.

The project is located along Lyons Creek, approximately 2 miles upstream of Lyons Lake in the South Fork Stanislaus Watershed. The meadow incurs resource damage by motor vehicles on a regular basis. 4WDs, ATVs, and motorcycles travel off an adjacent road into the meadow and creek area.

The District has used allocated California OHV Enforcement funds in the past to install no motor vehicle signs within the project area in an attempt to restrict vehicles to the system road and to keep vehicles out of the meadow. Signs have been ineffective in gaining compliance due to easy access into the meadow and a lack of physical or natural barriers.

Upon completion and issuance of a signed NEPA decision, project implementation activities will include restoration and permanent closure of approximately 3 acres of meadow impact area, placement of approximately 1200 feet of barriers, and installation of regulatory and information signs in the project area.

В. How the Proposed Project Relates to OHV Recreation

Analysis of Needs and Benefits

Approval of this planning/implementation request will enable the District to complete the necessary NEPA documentation and allow for project implementation. Both Forest Service specialist and local environmental groups have recommended this restoration project. Volunteers have worked on similar projects in the past and will be solicited to reduce overall implementation costs.

If the proposed project is delayed, adverse resource impacts will continue, potentially requiring a much larger restoration project in the future. By treating the small, localized meadow area while protecting sensitive resources and providing public education to users, general OHV use in the surrounding area on designated trails can continue. Without the Lyons Creek Meadow restoration project - if additional damage occurs, the entire area could be closed to OHV's.

Implementation of this project will restore the meadow and adjacent areas to a near natural setting enhancing wildlife, plant, and aquatic habitat, protecting cultural resources, and reducing soil loss and sedimentation into Lyons Creek. Lyons Creek is a tributary into Lyons Lake, a domestic water supply for Tuolumne County.

Additionally, this project will prevent off-route travel by placing physical barriers between the system road and meadow area and restoration of unauthorized user created trails. Reduced violations by OHV users may result as planned barriers are less susceptible to vandalism and will reinforce the vehicle-restricted area.

C. Size of Project Site

Approximately 3 acres of meadow impact area will be planned for and treated in the Lyons Creek Meadow Restoration Project..

Monitoring and Methodology D.

Project monitoring will include completion of impact area condition surveys and creation of a photo log to document area prior to project implementation. Additional photos will be taken at project completion and annually thereafter to document changes in project over time. Condition surveys will be completed every three years or as need is determined. Any

Page: 1 of 13 Version #

Application: Restoration - Miwok Planning

vandalism or incursions at site will be documented as well.

E. List of Reports

List of Reports & Documents to be produced:

- 1. Statement of detailed Proposed Action
- 2. Draft and final Specialist Analyses and Reports
- 3. Draft Decision Document
- 4. Final Decision Document
- 5. Project Monitoring File

All materials associated with the project will become part of the project record available for public review upon request.

F. Goals, Objectives and Methodology / Peer Reviews

The Lyons Creek Meadow Restoration Planning and Implementation Project does not involve scientific or cultural studies. The project area has been surveyed in the past for cultural resources. Review of past efforts will determine if protection/mitigation measures will be necessary during project implementation to protect cultural resources.

G. Plan for Protection of Restored Area

Monitoring of project will include routine patrols by FS LEOs and FPOs. District recreation staff will document any vandalism and intrusion into project area and will be responsible for scheduling and the completion of any repair needs.

Both enforcement and educational signs will be installed informing the visiting public of the project and reasons for implementation.

Version # Page: 2 of 13

Additional Documentation for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009 6/2/2009 Agency: USFS - Stanislaus National Forest Application: Restoration - Miwok Planning

	FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Version #	APP #
1.	Project-Specific Maps		
	Attachments:		Mi-Wok Restoration (Lyons Creek Meadow)
2.	Project-Specific Photos		
	Attachments:		Mi-Wok Restoration (Lyons Creek Meadow 1)
			Mi-Wok Restoration (Lyons Creek Meadow 2)
			Mi-Wok Restoration (Lyons Creek Meadow 3)
			Mi-Wok Restoration (Lyons Creek Meadow 4)
			Mi-Wok Restoration (Lyons Creek Meadow 5)

Version # Page: 3 of 13

	FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Version # _			APP #		
APPLICANT NAME :	USFS - Stanislaus National Forest						
PROJECT TITLE :	Restoration - Miwok Planning				PROJECT NUME (Division use on		
PROJECT TYPE :	☐ Acquisition ☐ I	Development		☐ Edu	ıcation & Safety	☐ Ground Op	erations
TROOLOT TITL.	Law Enforcement	Planning		✓ Res	storation		
General Project Description The Lyons Creek Meadow Restoration Planning grant proposal requests the funds needed to complete the National Environmenta analysis/decision documentation and funds for for implementation of a meadow restoration project near Lyons Creek on the Mi-Wc funding request covers all aspects of project planning: developing the proposed action, public scoping, resource surveys, analysis and documentation of the decision. An estimate (based on other similar projects with similar activities) of the funding needed to imalso part of the proposal. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project is located along Lyons Creek, approximately 2 miles upstream of Lyons Lake in the South Fork Stanislaus Watershed. resource damage by motor vehicles on a regular basis. 4WDs, ATVs, and motorcycles travel off an adjacent road into the meadow. The District has used allocated California OHV Enforcement funds in the past to install no motor vehicle signs within the project are restrict vehicles to the system road and to keep vehicles out of the meadow. Signs have been ineffective in gaining compliance du meadow and a lack of physical or natural barriers. Upon completion and issuance of a signed NEPA decision, project implementation activities will include restoration and permanen 3 acres of meadow impact area, placement of approximately 1200 feet of barriers, and installation of regulatory and information signals.				Creek on the Mi-Wok Fire surveys, analysis, evanding needed to imple mislaus Watershed. Thad into the meadow and within the project area ining compliance due to too and permanent closes.	Ranger District. The valuation and reports, ement the project is e meadow incurs ad creek area. In an attempt to easy access into the posure of approximately		
Line Item		Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
DIRECT EXPENSES							
Program Expenses							
1 Staff							
-	Admin Staff (Planning) ent and administrative costs for project will be	4.000	372.000	DAY	0.00	1,488.00	1,488.00
Other-OHV/Recreation Staff (Planning) Notes: OHV/Recreation staff will serve as project lead/interdisciplinary team leader on project.		15.000	290.000	DAY	3,480.00	870.00	4,350.00

Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
Other-Botanist (Planning) Notes : Interdisciplinary Team Member	8.000	290.000	DAY	1,740.00	580.00	2,320.00
Other-Wildlife Biologist (Planning) Notes : Interdisciplinary Team Member	8.000	290.000	DAY	1,740.00	580.00	2,320.00
Other-Hydrologist/Soils (Planning)	8.000	290.000	DAY	1,740.00	580.00	2,320.00
Other-Archaelogist (Planning) Notes : Interdisciplinary Team Member	8.000	290.000	DAY	1,740.00	580.00	2,320.00
Other-Management/Admin Staff (Implementa Notes: All management and administrative costs for project will be FS match.	1.000	372.000	DAY	0.00	372.00	372.00
Other-OHV/Rec Technician (Implementation	10.000	290.000	DAY	2,900.00	0.00	2,900.00
Other-OHV/Rec Technician (Implementation	10.000	240.000	DAY	2,400.00	0.00	2,400.00
Other-LEO (Monitoring) Notes: Project monitoring and enforcement	6.000	400.000	DAY	0.00	2,400.00	2,400.00
Other-FPO (Monitoring) Notes : Project monitoring and enforcement	10.000	290.000	DAY	1,450.00	1,450.00	2,900.00
Other-OHV/Rec Volunteers (Implementation	15.000	126.000	DAY	0.00	1,890.00	1,890.00
Other-Sign Crew (Implementation) Notes: Installation of project signing	2.000	490.000	DAY	980.00	0.00	980.00
Other-FPO (Monitoring) Notes: Prevention patrol project monitoring and enforcement	10.000	290.000	DAY	0.00	2,900.00	2,900.00
Total for Staff				18,170.00	13,690.00	31,860.00
Contracts						
Other-Backhoe w/Operator	5.000	760.000	DAY	3,800.00	0.00	3,800.00
Materials / Supplies						

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Other-Printing of letters/maps/doc. (Pla	500.000	0.500	EA	0.00	250.00	250.00
	Other-Postage (Planning)	500.000	0.440	EA	220.00	0.00	220.00
	Other-Newspaper Legal Notice (Planning)	2.000	200.000	EA	400.00	0.00	400.00
	Signs Notes : (e.g., fiberglass post with decals)	30.000	30.000	EA	900.00	0.00	900.00
	Signs Notes: (e.g., approx. 24X24 inch project information, education, and enforcement signing)	10.000	100.000	EA	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00
	Signs Notes: (e.g., approx. 48X48 inch project information, education, and enforcement signing)	4.000	300.000	EA	1,200.00	0.00	1,200.00
	Other-Barriers (Rock) Notes: Purchase and delivery of rock boulder barriers to project site	390.000	35.000	MISC	13,650.00	0.00	13,650.00
	Other-Supplies Notes : Misc. supplies (e.g., concrete, bolts, paint)	1000.000	1.000	MISC	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00
	Other-Tools Notes: Misc. tools and equipment (e.g., shovels, powersaw, drill)	250.000	1.000	MISC	250.00	0.00	250.00
	Total for Materials / Supplies	18,620.00	250.00	18,870.00			
4 Equipment Use Expenses							
	Other-FOR- 4WD Truck (Planning)	15.000	14.000	DAY	0.00	210.00	210.00
	Other-Mileage- 4WD Truck (Planning)	15.000	7.000	DAY	0.00	105.00	105.00
	Other-FOR- 4WD Truck (Implementation)	23.000	14.000	DAY	0.00	322.00	322.00
	Other-Mileage- 4WD Truck (Implementation	23.000	7.000	DAY	0.00	161.00	161.00
	Total for Equipment Use Expenses				0.00	798.00	798.00

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
5	Equipment Purchases						
6	Others						
7	Administrative Costs						
	Administrative Costs-Administrative Cost Notes: (10% administrative cost)	1.000	3186.000	MISC	0.00	3,186.00	3,186.00
Total	Program Expenses		40,590.00	17,924.00	58,514.00		
тота	TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES					17,924.00	58,514.00
тота	L EXPENDITURES		40,590.00	17,924.00	58,514.00		

	I in a Mana	Crant Barreat	Matak	Tatal	Nowestive				
	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	lotai	Narrative				
DIRE	ECT EXPENSES								
Prog	Program Expenses								
1	Staff	18,170.00	13,690.00	31,860.00					
2	Contracts	3,800.00	0.00	3,800.00					
3	Materials / Supplies	18,620.00	250.00	18,870.00					
4	Equipment Use Expenses	0.00	798.00	798.00					
5	Equipment Purchases	0.00	0.00	0.00					
6	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00					
7	Administrative Costs	0.00	3,186.00	3,186.00					
Total Program Expenses		40,590.00	17,924.00	58,514.00					
тот	AL DIRECT EXPENSES	40,590.00	17,924.00	58,514.00					
тот	AL EXPENDITURES	40,590.00	17,924.00	58,514.00					

Environmental Review Data Sheet (ERDS) for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
Agency: USFS - Stanislaus National Forest
Application: Restoration - Miwok Planning

	FO	R OFFICE USE ONLY:	Version #	APP #				
ľ	TEM 1 and ITEN	1 2						
a.	ITEM 1 - Has a (Please select	CEQA Notice of Determinates	tion (NOD) been file	ed for the Project?	С	Yes	•	No
	ITEM 2							
b.	ITEM 2 - Are th (Please select	e proposed activities a "Proj Yes or No)	iect" under CEQA (Guidelines Section 15378?	•	Yes	C	No
C.	and ensure pub	is requesting funds solely folic safety. These activities with a re thus not a "Project" ur	vould not cause any	physical impacts on the	C	Yes	С	No
d.	•	why proposed activities wou er CEQA. DO NOT complet		nysical impacts on the envir	onn	nent and	are 1	thus not

ITEM 3 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

The Lyons Creek Meadow Restoration Planning Project is a request for planning and implementation funds to complete the needed environmental planning and implementation of a meadow restoration project. It is anticipated that upon completion of planning, the project can be implemented providing restoration of and protection to the Lyons Creek Meadow and nearby Lyons Creek. The completed project (including implementation) will have a positive impact on wetlands, waterways, sensitive hapitat and species as the meadow area will be restored and future OHV use of the meadow prohitbited.

The overall objective of the project is to protect Lyons Creek Meadow through restoration activities and through the prevention of future unauthorized motorized use of the area. Mitigation measures identified during the NEPA planning process will be implemented during the project to ensure that no impacts to wetlands and sensitive habitats and species occur as a result of meadow restoration activities.

ITEM 4 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

The cumulative impacts of the Lyons Creek Meadow Restoration Planning and Implementation Project will be addressed in the NEPA document prepared should this project be funded.

ITEM 5 - Soil Impacts

The Lyons Creek Meadow Restoration Planning Project will complete the NEPA analysis and decision to implement the proposed action. Specifically related to soil impacts, the proposed project will likely improve the environmental conditions of the area. Ongoing rutting and erosion of the meadow will be curtailed. Loss of soil into Lyons Creek and Lyons Lake downstream will be addressed and minimized, thus improving the water quality of Lyons Lake, a community water source.

ITEM 6 - Damage to Scenic Resources

The location of the Lyons Creek Meadow Restoration Planning Project is not visbile from State Highway 108, the highway closest to the proposed project. The visual and scenic qualities of the localized area will be improved once the project is implemented as the meadow will be restored to its original condition. Proposed barriers will be natural and blend into the surrounding environment while providing meadow protection from vehicle incursions.

ITEM 7 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Yes No Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No)

Version # Page: 9 of 13

Page: 10 of 13

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

ITEM 8 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to Yes No historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No)

If YES, describe the potential impacts and for any substantially adverse changes in the significance of historical or cultural resources and measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the impacts.

ITEM 9 - Indirect Significant Impacts

The Lyons Creek Meadow Restoration Planning Project is not expected to cause indirect significant impacts on site or elsewhere. Currently, meadow instrusion by OHV's is taking place. By restoring the meadow and providing educational signing and information to users, we are hopeful that OHV users will stay on appropriate routes rather than travel off route.

CEQA/NEPA Attachment

Version #

6/2/2009

Evaluation Criteria for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009 Agency: USFS - Stanislaus National Forest Application: Restoration - Miwok Planning

		FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # APP #
1.		Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)
	1.	As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is: 3
		(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list) 76% or more (10 points) 51% - 75% (5 points) 26% - 50% (3 points) 25% (Match minimum) (No points)
2.		Natural and Cultural Resources - Q 2.
	2.	Natural and Cultural Resources - Failure to fund the Project will result in adverse impacts to: 9
		(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)
		☐ Archeological and historical resources identified in the California Register of Historical Resources or the Federal Register of Historic Places (3 points)
		✓ Stream or other watercourse (3 points)
		✓ Soils - Site actively eroding (2 points)
		☐ Sensitive areas (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of sensitive habitats
		☐ Threatened and Endangered (T&E) listed species (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of T&E species
		Other special-status species- Number of special-status species (1 point each, up to a maximum of 3) Enter number of special-status species
		Describe the type and severity of impacts that might occur relative to the checked item(s):
		Lyons Creek feeds Lyons Lake, a significant domestic water supply source for Tuolumne County. Currently, OHV activies in the meadow are causing erosion and runoff directly into Lyons Creek and Lyons Lake downstream.
3.		Reason for Project - Q 3.
	3.	Reason for the Project 4
		(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)
		Protect special-status species or cultural site (4 points)
		Restore natural resource system damaged by OHV activity (4 points)
		OHV activity in a closed area (3 points)
		Alternative measures attempted, but failed (2 points)
		Management decision (1 point)
		Scientific and cultural studies (1 point)
		Planning efforts associated with Restoration (1 point)
		Reference Document
		Project NEPA analysis and decision is part of this funding request. Project need first identified as part of the 2006 OHV grant application process.

Measures to Ensure Success - Q 4.

4. Measures to ensure success -The Project makes use of the following elements to ensure successful implementation 12

Page: 11 of 13 Version #

5.

6.

7.

Explain each statement that was checked

route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5 (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list) No (No points) Pyes (5 points) Identify plan 1991 Stanislaus National Forest Land Management Plan, as amended; 1998 Stanislaus National Forest Motor Vehicle Travel Manement Forest Plan Amendment; 2009 Motorized Travel Management - Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Site specific NEPA analysis and decision are part of this funding request. Public involvement is part of the process. Primary Funding Source - Q 6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5 (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list) Paplicant's operational budget (5 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) Other Trust Funds (No points) If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s): Future operational costs to be minimal (related only to monitoring of restoration). Outyear Agency operational budget not yet developed. Public Input - Q 7.		
Site monitoring: routine monitoring of project site can be readily accomplished as Forest personnel are in the area on a regular basis during the summer season. Project focus is the construction and installation of barriers to prevent further site damage by controlling vehicle access. Native materials (downed logs) will be used for barriers. Interpertive materials and signs will be designed, constructed and installed at the project site to inform the public of the need for restoration. OHV use will be re-directed to appropriate/legal OHV routes in the area. Publicty Reviewed Plan - Q 5. 5. Is there a publicly reviewed and adopted plan (e.g., wilderness designation, land management plans, route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5 (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list) No (No points) Pyes (5 points) Identify plan 1991 Stanislaus National Forest Land Management Plan, as amended; 1998 Stanislaus National Forest Motor Vehicle Travel Management Forest Plan Amendment; 2009 Motorized Travel Management - Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Site specific NEPA analysis and decision are part of this funding request. Public involvement is part of the process. Primary Funding Source - Q 6. Primary Funding Source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5 (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list) Applicant's operational budget (5 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) Tother Grant funding (2 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) Tother Grant funding (2 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) Tother Grant funding (2 points)		 ✓ Site monitoring to prevent additional damage ✓ Construction of barriers and other traffic control devices ✓ Use of native plants and materials ✓ Incorporation of universally recognized 'Best Management Practices' ✓ Educational signage
on a regular basis during the summer season. Project focus is the construction and installation of barriers to prevent further site damage by controlling vehicle access. Native materials (downed logs) will be used for barriers. Interpertive materials and signs will be designed, constructed and installed at the project site to inform the public of the need for restoration. OHV use will be re-directed to appropriate/legal OHV routes in the area. Publicly Reviewed Plan - Q 5. 5. Is there a publicly reviewed and adopted plan (e.g., wildemess designation, land management plans, route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5 (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list) No (No points) Pyes (5 points) Identify plan 1991 Stanislaus National Forest Land Management Plan, as amended; 1998 Stanislaus National Forest Motor Vehicle Travel Manament Forest Plan Amendment; 2009 Motorized Travel Management - Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Site specific NEPA analysis and decision are part of this funding request. Public involvement is part of the process. Primary Funding Source - Q 6. Primary Funding Source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5 (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list) Applicant's operational budget (5 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s): Future operational costs to be minimal (related only to monitoring of restoration). Outyear Agency operational budget not yet developed. Public Input - Q 7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2 (Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values) General values and content of the content of the content of the point) Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)		Explain each item checked above:
Is there a publicly reviewed and adopted plan (e.g., wilderness designation, land management plans, route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5 (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list) No (No points) Ves (5 points) Identify plan 1991 Stanislaus National Forest Land Management Plan, as amended; 1998 Stanislaus National Forest Motor Vehicle Travel Management Forest Plan Amendment; 2009 Motorized Travel Management - Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Site specific NEPA analysis and decision are part of this funding request. Public involvement is part of the process. Primary Funding Source - Q 6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5 (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list) Applicant's operational budget (5 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) Othy Trust Funds (No points) If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s): Future operational costs to be minimal (related only to monitoring of restoration). Outyear Agency operational budget not yet developed. Public Input - Q 7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2 (Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values) Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)		on a regular basis during the summer season. Project focus is the construction and installation of barriers to prevent further site damage by controlling vehicle access. Native materials (downed logs) will be used for barriers. Interpertive materials and signs will be designed, constructed and installed at the project site to inform the public of
route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5 (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list) No (No points) Pyes (5 points) Identify plan 1991 Stanislaus National Forest Land Management Plan, as amended; 1998 Stanislaus National Forest Motor Vehicle Travel Management Forest Plan Amendment; 2009 Motorized Travel Management - Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Site specific NEPA analysis and decision are part of this funding request. Public involvement is part of the process. Primary Funding Source - Q 6. Primary Funding Source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5 (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list) Applicant's operational budget (5 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) OHV Trust Funds (No points) If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s): Future operational costs to be minimal (related only to monitoring of restoration). Outyear Agency operational budget not yet developed. Public Input - Q 7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2 (Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values) Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point) Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)		Publicly Reviewed Plan - Q 5.
Identify plan 1991 Stanislaus National Forest Land Management Plan, as amended; 1998 Stanislaus National Forest Motor Vehicle Travel Manement Forest Plan Amendment; 2009 Motorized Travel Management - Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Site specific NEPA analysis and decision are part of this funding request. Public involvement is part of the process. Primary Funding Source - Q 6. 6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5 (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list) Applicant's operational budget (5 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) Hoperational budget' is checked, list reference document(s): Future operational costs to be minimal (related only to monitoring of restoration). Outyear Agency operational budget not yet developed. Public Input - Q 7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2 (Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values) Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point) Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)	5.	
Identify plan 1991 Stanislaus National Forest Land Management Plan, as amended; 1998 Stanislaus National Forest Motor Vehicle Travel Manement Forest Plan Amendment; 2009 Motorized Travel Management - Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Site specific NEPA analysis and decision are part of this funding request. Public involvement is part of the process. Primary Funding Source - Q 6. 6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5 (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list) Applicant's operational budget (5 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) OHV Trust Funds (No points) If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s): Future operational costs to be minimal (related only to monitoring of restoration). Outyear Agency operational budget not yet developed. Public Input - Q 7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2 (Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values) Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point) Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)		(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)
1991 Stanislaus National Forest Land Management Plan, as amended; 1998 Stanislaus National Forest Motor Vehicle Travel Manement Forest Plan Amendment; 2009 Motorized Travel Management - Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Site specific NEPA analysis and decision are part of this funding request. Public involvement is part of the process. Primary Funding Source - Q 6. 6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5 (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)		No (No points) Yes (5 points)
Vehicle Travel Manement Forest Plan Amendment; 2009 Motorized Travel Management - Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Site specific NEPA analysis and decision are part of this funding request. Public involvement is part of the process. Primary Funding Source - Q 6. 6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5 (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list) Applicant's operational budget (5 points) Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) OHV Trust Funds (No points) If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s): Future operational costs to be minimal (related only to monitoring of restoration). Outyear Agency operational budget not yet developed. Public Input - Q 7. 7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2 (Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values) Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point) Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)		Identify plan
6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5 (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list) Applicant's operational budget (5 points) Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points) Other Grant funding (2 points) OHV Trust Funds (No points) If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s): Future operational costs to be minimal (related only to monitoring of restoration). Outyear Agency operational budget not yet developed. Public Input - Q 7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2 (Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values) Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point) Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)		Vehicle Travel Manement Forest Plan Amendment; 2009 Motorized Travel Management - Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Site specific NEPA analysis and decision are part of this funding request. Public
(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)		Primary Funding Source - Q 6.
 ♠ Applicant's operational budget (5 points) ♠ Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points) ♠ Other Grant funding (2 points) ♠ OHV Trust Funds (No points) If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s): Future operational costs to be minimal (related only to monitoring of restoration). Outyear Agency operational budget not yet developed. Public Input - Q 7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2 (Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values) ➡ Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point) ➡ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point) 	6.	Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5
C Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points) C Other Grant funding (2 points) C OHV Trust Funds (No points) If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s): Future operational costs to be minimal (related only to monitoring of restoration). Outyear Agency operational budget not yet developed. Public Input - Q 7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2 (Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values) Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point) C Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)		(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)
 C Other Grant funding (2 points) C OHV Trust Funds (No points) If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s): Future operational costs to be minimal (related only to monitoring of restoration). Outyear Agency operational budget not yet developed. Public Input - Q 7. 7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2 (Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values) ✓ Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point) ✓ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point) 		
 C OHV Trust Funds (No points) If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s): Future operational costs to be minimal (related only to monitoring of restoration). Outyear Agency operational budget not yet developed. Public Input - Q 7. 7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2 (Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values) ✓ Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point) ✓ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point) 		
If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s): Future operational costs to be minimal (related only to monitoring of restoration). Outyear Agency operational budget not yet developed. Public Input - Q 7. 7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2 (Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values) Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point) Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)		
 Future operational costs to be minimal (related only to monitoring of restoration). Outyear Agency operational budget not yet developed. Public Input - Q 7. 7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2 (Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values) Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point) Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point) 		
7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2 (Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values) Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point) Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)		Future operational costs to be minimal (related only to monitoring of restoration). Outyear Agency operational
(Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values) ✓ Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point) ✓ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)		Public Input - Q 7.
✓ Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)✓ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)	7.	The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2
		 ✓ Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point) ✓ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)

Page: 12 of 13 Version #

Application: Restoration - Miwok Planning

The Lyons Creek Meadow Restoration Planning and Implementation Project was first developed as part of the 2006 Stanislaus National Forest Off-Highway Vehicle Grant Application. Public meetings were held to share the grant application and to seek comments and feedback. Recent telephone contacts with local interested parties and stakeholders confirmed continued project support.

0	Hilization of	Dartnerchine 00

8.	(Utilization of Partnerships - Q 8.		
	8.	The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 4		
		(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select	et one from list)	
		• 4 or more (4 points)	© 2 to 3 (2 points)	
		C 1 (1 point)	None (No points)	
		List partner organization(s):		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Mula Dans Foundation Tri County Off Bood Club Individual	
		Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center, Mule Deer Foundation, Tri-County Off Road Club, I Volunteers		
9.	,	Scientific and Cultural Studies - Q 9.		
	Scientific and cultural studies will 5			
		(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)		
		✓ Determine appropriate Restoration techniq	ues (2 points)	
			on on natural or cultural resources (2 points)	
		▼ Examine methods to ensure success of Restoration efforts (1 point)		
	Lead to direct management action (1 point)			
	Explain each item checked above			
	Appropriate resource surveys (cultural resources, hydrological, biological, botanical) will be completed fo			
		project,. Findings will be documented and used to complete the anlysis of the proposed restoration project activities. Alternative methods may be considered. The final decision will document the action to be taken to ensure protection of resources and long term effectiveness of project implementation.		
10.		Underlying Problem - Q 10.		
	10.	The underlying problem that resulted in the nee addressed and resolved 3	d for the Restoration Project has been effectively	
		(Check the one most appropriate) (Please selec	ct one from list)	
		No (No points)	Yes (3 points)	
		Explain 'Yes' answer		
	The need for the project is obvious given the conditon of Lyons Creek Meadow. The specific NEPA planni			
		process to consider alternatives and document the ultimate decision is part of this funding request.		
11.		Size of sensitive habitats - Q 11.		
	11.	Size of sensitive habitats (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) within the Project Area which will be restored 3		
		(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select	ct one from list)	
		C Greater than 10 acres (5 points)		
		C Less than 1 acre (1 points)		

Version # Page: 13 of 13

No sensitive habitat within Project Area (No points)